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CONTESTING MEANINGS OF THE “UNEMPLOYED” IN SINGAPORE

Neo Yu Wei & Jessica Huang

“Many economists would consider Singapore as a country with full or almost full employment ... In reality, the lived experiences of people who are considered “not working” are far more complex.”

INTRODUCTION

This article reports on findings that are 'snippets' from a qualitative study in a larger mixed method study on the lived experiences of ‘unemployed’ clients conducted by Montfort Care, under SSR’s Mentoring Programme. The main objective of this article is to compare the clients’ lived experiences of being unemployed with the definition of ‘unemployment’ by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Singapore Ministry of Manpower (MOM), the barriers encountered in seeking stable employment, and the implications for policies and services for the unemployed person.

The way that policies and services define social “problems” is critical in determining how these “problems” should be addressed. Understanding the “problem” of unemployment by looking at the official definitions and understanding what unemployment means to people who have not been in work for a period of time will support the premise that policy definitions need to be framed more closely to the lived realities of the unemployed. Misclassification of people in different categories of working statuses will result in an inaccurate understanding of the scale and nature of the “problem” and lead to people falling through the ‘cracks’ in safety nets that are meant to support them.

Unemployment among residents in Singapore is defined as persons aged 15 and above, not working but actively looking for work during the period of reference (Ministry of Manpower, Singapore, 2015). This definition is in line with that of the International Labour Organisation (ILO, 1982) which defined the ‘unemployed’ as having fulfilled the following three criteria in the stated order:

a. Without any paid employment
b. Actively seeking employment
c. Available for employment

Based on this definition, a person who is not working and is not looking for work nor is ready for work will not be defined as “unemployed” by the MOM. Instead, the individual will be considered as “economically inactive”. Students, homemakers and retirees are therefore not considered as “unemployed” even though they are not working.

Framed in this way, the unemployment rate of 3.3% among Singapore citizens in 2017 (Ministry of Manpower, 2018) and 0.8% of residents “long-term unemployment” in 2016 (Ministry of Manpower 2016, p.35), are often described as “low” or “very low”. Many economists would consider Singapore as a country with full or almost full employment with the “problem” of unemployment constructed as an issue that may not be serious enough to warrant excessive policy attention.

In reality, the lived experiences of people who are considered “not working” are far more complex. There are many unskilled or low skilled, ad-hoc jobs that do not require formal job processes and the workers are largely recruited through informal networks or “word-of-mouth” or as workers on “service contract” jobs who are not counted in official statistics on employment. Other groups, such as homemakers, may be considered as “economically inactive” but are performing essential, unpaid caregiving work for their families though the value of their work continues to be unaccounted for in national budgets.

METHODOLODY

The study reported here utilized a qualitative approach to data collection and is part of a larger mixed method study conducted with clients classified as “unemployed” by Montfort Care social workers at three Montfort Care Family Service Centres (FSC).

i. The survey comprised 147 completed questionnaires by social workers on the profiles of their unemployed clients within the working age range of 16 to 67 years old (MOM’s official re-employment age limit).

The survey results were published in a separate report by Montfort Care.

ii. The qualitative study comprised of seven participants selected from the above survey (see Table 1 below for profiles). A face-to-face, semi-structured in-depth interview was conducted to find out more about their employment history and their experiences of being unemployed. Each interview lasted for about one hour and emergent themes were cross-analyzed by three analysts to check on consistency of interpretation of the data.

The results are published in this online platform.

Table 1: Profiles of Clients: In-depth interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Reasons for unemployment (based on survey results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mdm A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Physical health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Inability to find suitable jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Cultural beliefs on gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Physical health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Cultural beliefs on gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTESTING MEANINGS OF THE “UNEMPLOYED” (Cont.)

FINDINGS

The findings showed that the clients were not resistant towards finding work but faced a complex array of intersecting barriers to employment within a narrow range of options available in making their decisions to work or not to work. Clients expressed willingness to work if the barriers they faced could be removed or mitigated.

The main barriers that unemployed clients faced and their experiences with these barriers, both personal failures and circumstantial, are as follows:

1. Poor health

Poor health is often both the outcome of other underlying factors and the cause of unemployment. A wide range and levels of severity of health issues contributed to the difficulty of disentangling cause and effect factors between poor health and unemployment.

First, most low-skilled or unskilled jobs are physically demanding in nature requiring the workers to spend long hours in manual labor such as security services, building and construction work, factory work, delivery, cleaning or other services. The job options available to individuals with low educational qualifications or with no trade certifications are concentrated in these physically demanding yet low-paid jobs. Working in these jobs for a long period of time is likely to add continuous strain on the body resulting in poorer health. In some blue-collar jobs, the chances of work injury or accidents are also higher compared to white-collar jobs.

Second, clients in this study were often caught between deteriorating health which further limited the type of jobs they were able to take on to support themselves. Unless they suffer from serious impairment, disability or illnesses, it was difficult for them to obtain medical memos certifying that they were “medically unfit for work” which would qualify them for financial assistance schemes. Frequently, clients’ poor health might not warrant a medical memo or doctors were cautious in giving memos that endorse a long period of being “unfit for work” as illustrated below:

Mdm A suffered from chronic back pain and the loss of two of her closest family members to suicide but was neither sufficiently ill to receive a medical memo to be “unfit for work” nor sufficiently well for her to stay in a job for long. At her last employment, Mdm A’s employer did not renew her employment contract because she had taken many days of leave. When she applied for financial assistance, it was unsuccessful because it was perceived that she was employable. Mdm A’s poor health placed her in a Catch-22 situation that disqualified her for financial assistance and also disadvantaged her in seeking stable employment.

Clients with poor health would continue to look for a shrinking list of suitable jobs and struggle to balance between the need to work and the need to improve their health condition.

Some clients chose to continue looking for work even though they have medical memos because the ComCare Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance (SMTA) is short-term, subject to review and perceived as insufficient for their needs.

Third, poor health also affected clients’ ability to apply for financial assistance. For example, Mrs D missed several appointments with the Social Service Office (SSO) because of her health but when she recovered and approached the SSO again, she realized that her absences at previous appointments were perceived as an indication that her financial needs were “not critical”.

2. Caregiving as unpaid work

Caregiving is a common reason for women to leave the workforce and become full-time homemakers and is the prevalent reason for unemployment among married female clients. For some, cultural beliefs on gender roles play an important role in female clients’ decision to stop work and become a full-time caregiver at home. Cultural beliefs on gender roles are prevalent among many families regardless of socio-economic status but the difference for low-income families is that access to higher-paying jobs or support for childcare or eldercare for a single breadwinner is often limited.

Unpaid full-time caregivers are often perceived as “unproductive labor” and stereotyped as “ladies of leisure”. Homemakers (usually women), constitute an entire invisible sector of care work that is highly valued socially but is unpaid, unrecognized formally, and perpetuates women’s lower economic status compared to men. Higher-income families can outsource care for their children or elderly parents through hiring domestic helpers or paying for professional childcare or aged services allowing for both parents to join the workforce. Even with high childcare subsidies, families with low-income may choose not to access childcare because they are unable to commit to the structured schedules required by childcare centres. For example, low-income parents often take up shift-work and are unable to bring their children to and fro the childcare centres.

Women with low educational qualifications and limited work experiences face the options of staying home to be a full-time caregiver or to take up a low-skill, often unstable, job within a narrow range of options. When women become full-time caregivers, they face not only the stereotype of being “ladies of leisure”, but foregoing paid work is also seen as an “irrational” decision, particularly for low-income families. Mothers as full-time caregivers are perceived as making a poor choice by not contributing to their families’ income and may even be blamed for not taking up a job.

However, what we see in this study is that the employment options available to women with low education are limited, precarious and low-paid. Even if there are good job options, women worry about their working hours, as well as family duties. Women with higher-paying jobs are better able to balance work and family commitments through paying for professional help and likely to work in white-collar jobs with working hours aligned to childcare centre hours. But this is often not a choice available to mothers from low-income families. Instead, when these mothers become full-time caregivers, they see it as a rational means to invest their time on their children, bringing not only joy for themselves, but also for their families. They are forgoing short-term gains in their household incomes for a perceived longer-term benefit of being the main caregiver to their children. Unless the job options available to them are adequately paid, stable and allow them to meet both work and family commitments, it is not difficult to understand why they are reluctant to join the workforce.
“It would be easy to conclude that Mr B was “picky” about work... Understanding his history of poor health and struggles with increasing barriers provided a context which made his decision not to work or to find jobs that will incur the least cost to him valid and rational.”

FINDINGS

3. “UNMOTIVATED WORKERS” OR MISTAKING SYMPTOMS FOR CAUSES?

Perhaps the most misunderstood personal barrier of unemployment is the attribution to unemployment is a “lack in motivation” to seek employment. Being labeled “unmotivated” suggests that one chooses to be unemployed and is therefore responsible for the situation that s/he is in. The interviews showed that “motivation” in itself is dependent on many other factors and has to be understood in the context of how a worker becomes disengaged from seeking work. Is being “unmotivated” an effect of long-term unemployment or the reason behind it? Mr B below illustrates:

Mr B, aged 55 years, was perceived as “lacking in motivation” by his social worker. In spite of not having an income, Mr B was described as being too selective and only willing to work in a narrow range of jobs.

When Mr B was interviewed in the study, a more complex picture of his unemployment was formed considering his work history. Mr B worked for 12 years in the logistics industry in physically demanding jobs. However, he suffered from abdominal pains and other health issues that prevented him from working for a period of time. When he returned to work, his employers were unsympathetic towards his continuous struggles with ill health. When Mr B met with an accident and injured his back at work, it became difficult for him to continue in a job that required high levels of physical exertion. What affected Mr B was not that he was no longer employed but the indifferent attitude his employer over his accident. With failing health, Mr B could no longer work in physically demanding jobs that he would otherwise qualify for. Technical or service-related jobs were unsuitable for Mr B because he only had primary level qualifications and was not proficient in English. This narrowed the jobs available to him and also disqualified him from many training or “skills upgrading” courses required for other jobs. After leaving the logistics industry, Mr B considered working as a security officer, but soon realized that he needed a certificate to qualify for the position. Mr B also considered working as a cleaner but was perceived as being “picky” when he wanted to work at places near his home in order to save on transportation costs.

I don’t know how to say, ‘I lazy?’ At my age, 55, I never think to upgrade. Just healthy, can find work, good already. My study is only Primary 6, my English is very bad. People talk English I can understand, but I don’t know how to say back to them. I hope, if [other people are] same as me, I hope they can do better than me, upgrade themselves, don’t be like me.

It would be easy to conclude that Mr B was “picky” about work and lacked motivation to attend training or to find employment. Understanding his history of poor health and struggles with increasing barriers provided a context which made his decision not to work or to find jobs that will incur the least cost to him valid and rational.

4. HIDDEN WORK AND CONTRACTUAL JOBS

Unemployed clients occasionally took ad-hoc or short-term contractual jobs through their informal network of friends and family members. Homemakers might also take ad-hoc work, such as cooking or child-minding for their neighbors. For example, Ms E baked and cooked for her neighbors during festive occasions. Since she was cooking for her own family during these occasions she was happy to cook more for her neighbors.

Such ad hoc opportunities are important for women who are unemployed. Apart from earning a small fee, the women exhibited their skills and contributed to their community as intrinsic rewards not often associated with low-paid, low-skilled work with long hours. Furthermore, such informal networks become a source of on-going support for the unemployed women including sharing or referrals to other ad-hoc or casual job opportunities.

Being able to work in jobs that do not compromise their caregiving duties is critical for women who need to manage their time carefully with limited resources or support.

The availability of informal, ad-hoc work opportunities is also important because the gap to cross over to a full-time paid work is wide and daunting as Ms E reported below:

I think [I was unemployed for] about eight years? Yeah. So and then they ask me to do a resume. Then I was like, ‘What, resume? How long ago was that?’ I don’t even know the font, or how to do it now. To be honest, I didn’t really quite get it. I understand what he says, because when you want to apply for a specific job, you have to probably enhance a little bit more of your words to make it fit the bill right? Then I was like, ‘Okay, that’s too much of work.’ I prefer last time, you know when it’s just one resume and then you send out to all the companies. Now, like you have to be so fanciful, I was like, ‘Oh my god, it’s all about impressing people.’

In summary, the myth of long-term unemployed persons being lazy, choosy and unproductive are challenged in these interviews with clients who experienced multiple and interconnected barriers in finding jobs with a regular income. Within the narrow range of choices available to them and their attempts to ameliorate the difficulties they faced, their decisions to work or not to work were meaningful to them but perceived as “irrational” to others.
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This paper sets out to examine the experiences faced by individuals perceived as not working and contrasts them to unemployment as defined in policies and social services. The findings show that people who are considered “economically inactive” by policies are not necessarily disengaged from some form of work. The misalignment between how policies frame people who are not working as “inactive” and the lived experiences of unemployed persons has several implications:

**IMPLICATION A: WOMEN & WORK**

The efforts of women with unpaid work at home continue to be excluded as contribution to the economy. Changes to how women’s unemployment is defined and measured to take into account unpaid or informal work were proposed at the International Conference of Labour Statisticians in 2013 (UN Women, 2015, p.75). Nevertheless, the value of women’s unpaid work at home continues to be excluded in national budgets.

Although women, in general, face similar dilemmas regarding work and caregiving, women from low-income families have limited resources to engage professional assistance to relieve their caregiving duties. To qualify for financial assistance to access childcare services, families need to show evidence of both parents in employment and if one parent is unable to work because of caregiving duties, she will need to demonstrate she is a “certified caregiver”.

For women who are already in paid employment, it is likely they would have more resources to access childcare services. But for women in low-income families, it is precisely the lack of resources that is preventing them from accessing childcare. Faced with a choice of taking up a low-paying job within a narrow range of options in order to qualify for subsidies and a choice of foregoing the subsidies to become a full-time homemaker, it is unsurprising that some women decided on the latter because their roles as homemakers were experienced as more rewarding and fulfilling. This understanding of women and what “work” means to them need to be considered in policy designs. In particular, if unpaid caregiving work is intrinsically more rewarding in comparison to a low-paying, precarious job, it may be more effective to provide homemakers with a caregiver allowance instead of assistance through childcare subsidies.

**IMPLICATION B: HEALTH & WORK**

Although policies and financial assistance schemes recognize that people with health issues have genuine reasons for being unemployed, our study shows that it is difficult to obtain medical certification on the inability to work required to qualify for financial assistance. People with chronic health problems that are not deemed sufficiently serious to be an impediment to work are caught in a conundrum - inability to access sufficient financial assistance because they are deemed “medically fit for work” but will suffer frequent absenteeism from work if they do return to the workforce. Classifying people into strict categories based on their “fitness” to work misses the complex challenges people face when they attempt to balance work and health commitments. Policies need to consider and be sensitive to the inextricable association between health and work. Healthy individuals will be productive workers, and when individuals suffer from ill health the priority for support should be placed on returning their health to optimal levels rather than on just hastening their return to work.

**IMPLICATION C: DISCOURAGED WORKERS & INFORMAL WORK**

When policies define groups of people as “not actively seeking work” or “discouraged” (MOM, 2016), there is an implicit assumption that people not in work are passive or unmotivated to find work. This has an indirect effect of perpetuating stereotypes of people not in work as “unmotivated” or “lazy”. In our interviews, it was clear that individuals who appeared to be “unmotivated” actually had a long history of struggling with precarious jobs, poor health and low wages. The ILO recognizes that the misalignment between how unemployment is defined and how unemployment is experienced needs to be addressed (ILO, 2008). A more nuanced conceptualization of unemployment in the context of labour underutilization has been proposed (ILO, 2008). Nevertheless, this concept of “labour underutilization” has not been popular in public discourse and the conventional understanding of “unemployment” continues to dominate the conceptualization of the problem as people “not being motivated to work” rather than as people “not able to, or not sufficiently employed”.
CONCLUSION

How “unemployment” is conceptualized and measured is important because this definition frames the way we understand the “problem”. The ILO (2008) proposal for a more nuanced and differentiated categories of people not in work also has the effect of artificially minimizing the size of the problem where each distinctive category captures a specific group of people not in work. Our study shows that people move in and out of these categories, sometimes “discouraged”, sometimes “economically inactive”, sometimes “unemployed”. The study also shows the interplay between individual and structural factors behind the reasons for not working. These categories are experienced as a whole continuum of lived realities for people who are not working. Delineating their work histories and the barriers they faced into distinct, multiple categories not only hides the depth and extent of the problems faced but also mask the complex, underlying reasons for people not in work.

Furthermore, when social services and financial assistance schemes are provided on the condition of work, it places low-income clients in another conundrum. In order to access services or schemes, clients who are already facing multiple barriers to work (i.e. poor health, caregiving responsibilities or limited work options) are required to find a job. It is precisely these barriers that are preventing them from finding a job in the first instance. Regardless of their employment status, every person has basic needs that should be met adequately. In particular, health needs and family responsibilities should be addressed before individuals could consider joining the workforce. To avoid a chicken or the egg situation, instead of providing conditional assistance for low-income clients based on their employment status, social policies and services need to focus first on removing employment barriers and provide adequate help to address basic needs for people in low-income households so that they can be ready to return to some form of employment if possible.

If you have any enquiries about this article, please contact Dr Neo Yu Wei at neoyuwei@nus.edu.sg.
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INTRODUCTION

The Social Service Research Centre (SSR), NUS, held a dialogue session on 25 January 2018 with social service professionals, public servants, and social service researchers with two main objectives. Firstly, to better understand the challenges the various parties encountered in conducting research. Secondly, to obtain feedback regarding SSR’s ongoing initiatives. The participants of the dialogue sessions comprised of social service practitioners, public servants, and staff from private foundations.

Prof Paul Cheung, Chairman of the SSR Steering Committee, opened the event by sharing that SSR was set up in 2014 to support and strengthen research in the sector as there is an increased shift towards evidence-based practice.

A/P Irene Ng, Director of the Social Service Research Centre, then shared on SSR’s progress in the past three years since its inception including the growth in staff strength, number of research projects, increase in research collaborations, and other platforms to inform and equip the sector about research. She also touched on the three main thrusts of SSR’s programs for the sector: equipping practitioners with foundational knowledge on social service research; building research capabilities; and, fostering research collaboration. Feedback on key issues and suggestions are as follows:

1. Firstly, funders and management may not immediately see the importance of practice research and would want to see the outcomes of a small scale pilot before committing resources to larger research projects. The buy-in to practice research by funders is usually also conditional on a clear definition of research objectives. Agencies and practitioners will need to consider this issue in scoping their research projects such that funders and management will view funding practice research as a worthwhile endeavour. SSR can support the sector’s research initiatives by clarifying the scope and objectives of research proposals.

2. Secondly, a common problem facing VWOs is the lack of an Institutional Review Board (IRB) for ethics approval. Many agencies have raised this issue as they are concerned that they will not be able to publish their work or be eligible for certain types of funding if they do not obtain ethics approval. The organisation overseeing the sector-wide research ethics should have legal oversight over the social service sector and have an interest in protecting the various sectors and research participants. Organisations such as the National Council for Social Services (NCSS) and the Singapore Association of Social Workers (SASW) are possible organisations that can take on this role. The value of an ethics review goes beyond journal publication since it ensures that agencies conducting research actively are conscious of research ethics and legally protect their organisations and research participants. SSR is keen to support agencies in ensuring ethical research practices but would be unable to perform the role as a sector-wide review board since it is also subject to the NUS’ IRB Board for approval of its own research.
Thirdly, participants at the dialogue session explored different modes of collaboration via existing programmes such as the research mentoring program. SSR completed two runs of the research mentoring programme benefitting 41 participants from the sector. Participants saw the value of the mentoring programme but research projects require time to develop and thus a continuous 13-week program might not be fruitful for mentoring participants. Suggestions included providing a gap in between the full duration of the mentoring program so that mentoring participants have time to formulate their research projects and have more fruitful discussions with their mentors. Medical social workers also faced an additional problem of trying to clear their hospital’s Domain Specific Review Board (DSRB) during the 13-week period of the research mentoring program.

Fourth, participants also raised the need for research consultancy or advisory mentorship at certain points in the course of their own organisation’s research initiatives. Participants hoped that a third party could provide consultancy or research support but were also concerned about potential issues such as the ownership of IP (intellectual property) rights from research output in such collaborations.

The output produced by the research mentoring programme and the consultancy model is owned by the participants and/or participating agencies.

Fifth, additional concerns faced while conducting research included the need to have more networking and collaboration across the sector, managing relationships between researchers and practitioners, and the issue of limited resources available for research. The medical social work profession also raised specific methodological issues such as how medical research was often quantitative in nature and lacked the social and community dimension which they felt was an important perspective to include.

Last, practitioners would like to form networks or communities around research areas. Participants felt that such networks would allow them to understand what others in the sector are doing and provide avenues for collaboration. Within the sector, the National Council of Social Services has started the Communities of Practice (CoP) and a research depository to aggregate information related to research within the sector. SSR also conducts regular seminars that highlight research conducted by both academics and practitioners from various disciplines and fields of practice. These seminars can act as a networking platform for practitioners from the sector with similar interests or from similar fields.

We would like to thank the sector for their active participation in the dialogue session. Unfortunately in order to facilitate in-depth feedback there was a need to keep the number of participants small. A participant summarised SSR’s role as “providing guidance, expert knowledge and resources”, and indeed SSR will continue to work together with the sector in strengthening social service research.
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